



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20251
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/601,111	07/27/2000	PASCAL COOREMAN	032326-073	5591

21839 7590 09/26/2002
BURNS DOANE SWECKER & MATHIS L L P
POST OFFICE BOX 1404
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER


TAYLOR, LARRY D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2876

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/601,111	Applicant(s) COOREMAN ET AL. 	
	Examiner Larry D Taylor	Art Unit 2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of Amendment

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed 30 April 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 5,729,004, as cited by applicant) in view of Anderl et al. (US 4,816,654).

Kim et al disclose a data communication device and method of a smart card comprising: a microprocessor 61,62 and contacts (input/output terminals); a communication device hard wired between the contacts and the microprocessor and operating according to an asynchronous communication protocol with checking of integrity of signal transmitted between the microprocessor and a terminal 30 (I/O device) (see figure 3 and col. 10, line 40). (see figures 3-10, col. 4, line 1+ and col. 7, line 16+).

Kim teaches that the terminal transmits a signal to the card regarding whether the integrity of the data, including if the data transmitted has any errors. However, it is not specifically stated that the communication device of the card responds to the terminal with an item of information.

It would have been notoriously obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to design the card to respond to an integrity signal transmitted by the terminal. Anderl supports this concept, as it shows a memory card 10 resending data to a terminal after an initial attempt to send data to a reader 15 resulted in the reader transmitting an "error-in-data-integrity" signal or "unsuccessful-data-transmittance" signal (see col. 10, lines 38-46 and col. 11, lines 36-53). It would have been known to have the card transmit data in response to integrity signal from the terminal, for reasons as simple as automatically resending the data to the terminal or requesting data to help correct the integrity of the data. Such known reasons are also evidenced by the applicants in page 6 of paper number 6. Since the communication device is the card's means of communication any data to and from the terminal, it would be obvious that, while the microprocessor of the card controls the functions of all transmittance and reception of information, the communication device actually returns data to the terminal.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 2-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: although the prior art discloses a smart card that is operating in asynchronous protocol, the prior art of record fails to teach or fairly suggest in combination to disclose all the steps operational

Art Unit: 2876

process, which includes determining each character from a series of pulse signals, analyzing the characters of the command and supplying a code, etc.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious for the card to respond to a signal from the terminal regarding an integrity check of data transferred between the two, if only to resend the data or correct the integrity of the data. Such a method is common in the art of data transmittance between electronic devices. The Examiner would, however, like to reiterate the allowable subject matter as presented within the limitations of claim 2.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Larry D Taylor whose telephone number is (703) 306-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30 - 5:00).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Lee can be reached on (703)-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)-746-4784 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2876

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Larry D Taylor
September 23, 2002



MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800